

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

CORDIS CORPORATION,)
)
 Plaintiff,)
)
 v.) Civ. No. 97-550-SLR
) (Consolidated)
 MEDTRONIC VASCULAR, INC.,)
)
 Defendant.)

MEDTRONIC VASCULAR, INC.,)
)
 Plaintiff,)
)
 v.) Civ. No. 97-700-SLR
)
 CORDIS CORPORATION; JOHNSON &)
 JOHNSON; and EXPANDABLE)
 GRAFTS PARTNERSHIP,)
)
 Defendants.)

SPECIAL VERDICT FORM

We, the jury, unanimously find as follows:

Infringement

1. Has Cordis shown by a preponderance of the evidence that Medtronic AVE's MicroStent II infringes the limitation of the asserted claims (claims 23, 51, and 54 of the '762 patent and claims 1 and 3 of the '984 patent) requiring that the wall of a tubular member have a substantially uniform thickness? (A "YES" answer to this question is a finding for Cordis. A "NO" answer is a finding for Medtronic AVE.)

YES X NO

2. Has Cordis shown by a preponderance of the evidence that Medtronic AVE's GFX stent infringes the limitation of the asserted claims (claims 23, 51, and 54 of the '762 patent and claims 1 and 3 of the '984 patent) requiring that the wall of a tubular member have a substantially uniform thickness? (A "YES" answer to this question is a finding for Cordis. A "NO" answer is a finding for Medtronic AVE.)

YES X NO

3. Has Cordis shown by a preponderance of the evidence that Medtronic AVE's GFX 2 stent infringes the limitation of the asserted claims (claims 23, 51, and 54 of the '762 patent and claims 1 and 3 of the '984 patent) requiring that the wall of a tubular member have a substantially uniform thickness? (A "YES" answer to this question is a finding for Cordis. A "NO" answer is a finding for Medtronic AVE.)

YES X NO

Invalidity

Do you find that Medtronic AVE has shown by clear and convincing evidence that any of the following claims of the patents in suit are invalid due to obviousness? (A "YES" answer is a finding for Medtronic AVE. A "NO" answer is a finding for Cordis.)

Claim 23 of the '762 patent	YES <u> </u>	NO <u>X</u>
Claim 51 of the '762 patent	YES <u> </u>	NO <u>X</u>
Claim 54 of the '762 patent	YES <u> </u>	NO <u>X</u>
Claim 1 of the '984 patent	YES <u> </u>	NO <u>X</u>
Claim 3 of the '984 patent	YES <u> </u>	NO <u>X</u>

You must sign this Verdict Form.

Dated: March 14 , 2005

Ruth C. Linton

FOREPERSON

Michael W. J. T.

Gordon Mitchell

John Thomas

Paul C. J.

Joan M. Wheeler

William P. Tull

Susan Mullin